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CGIAR is a global partnership that unites organizations engaged in research for a food-secure future. The CGIAR Research Program on Livestock provides research-based solutions to help smallholder farmers, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists transition to sustainable, resilient livelihoods and to productive enterprises that will help feed future generations. It aims to increase the productivity of livestock agri-food systems in sustainable ways, making meat, milk and eggs more available and affordable across the developing world. The Program brings together five core partners: the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) with a mandate on livestock; the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), which works on forages; the International Center for Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), which works on small ruminants and dryland systems; the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU) with expertise particularly in animal health and genetics and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) which connects research into development and innovation and scaling processes.

The Program thanks all donors and organizations who globally supported its work through their contributions to the [**CGIAR system**](http://www.cgiar.org/about-us/our-funders/)
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**Participants:**

**In Nairobi**

Iain Wright (ILRI)

Nicoline der Haan (ILRI)

Tom Randolph (ILRI)

Katie Hamilton (ILRI)

**By Webex**

Barbara Rischkowsky (ICARDA)

Ulf Magnusson (SLU)

**Apologies**

Misja Brandenberg (ILRI)

Paul Schuetz (GIZ)

Michael Peters (CIAT)

**PMC Terms of Reference**

The ToR’s were circulated to each partner institution when requesting the nomination of their representative and comments received were addressed. Two points to highlight and discuss as below.

*Reviewing and approving POWB* –PMC members are already involved in preparing the POWB, so does it make sense to have a ‘review and approve’ function as PMC? Yes, in addition to contributing, the PMC provides oversight to improve **coherence** and **quality** of the POWB. The week for review and final check is sufficient. This was agreed by **consensus**.

*Annual Performance Monitoring Report*. As part of overseeing program implementation and CRP M&E system, what are expectations for PMC review and approval of the report. It was agreed this is an important responsibility of the committee, as is reviewing partner and research performance. The PMC will need to push for and agree on meaningful indicators to measure and then act upon as needed, as part of the overall CRP M&E. **The** **Committee agrees it is an important responsibility of committee and to support development of more adaptive management systems going forward.**

***Action Point: TR to revise wording***

**2017 SIF allocation**

The allocation of the 2017 Strategic Investment Fund was discussed, taking into account initiatives started under L&F and the Science Council funding decision.

* Activities have been proposed that are critical for the overall CRP, but must not represent LLAFS or F&F research activities.
* The CRP director proposes the SIF allocation, for PMC comment and endorsement. Proposals are prepared for each set of activities, for comment and endorsement by the PMC.
* Budget cuts now translate into SIF being 20% of W1/2; **PMC agreed the principle of maintaining 10% of W1/2 for strategic investment**.
* **The principle that SIF should be used for one-off investments was confirmed.** Any additional recurrent costs then need to be incorporated into the regular budget
* The proposed 2017 SIF allocations were presented. **PMC endorsed the proposed 2017 SIF allocations**.
* The allocation will be shared with the SMO for information this year given the SC funding decision, but is not expected to be in the future
* Any money not committed to specific activities will be available for strategic research calls
* Recognizing completing tasks within the same year is not always possible, SIF commitments, especially for research calls, may be for multiple years

**2017 POWB**

Now that the POWB has been submitted, the final version will serve as the reference for what was agreed in terms of deliverables, and staff and budgetary commitments.

* + Summary and detailed Activity Sheets are being prepared for this purpose, to be posted on the wiki
  + Partner Finance officers will be asked to ‘sign off’ on them
  + The teams contributing to each flagship will now be identified. The expectation is that flagship leaders will be aware of any staff time supported by W1/2 and manage it as needed, as well as any reallocations of staff time or budget by activity during the year.

**Independent Steering Committee**

Constituting the ISC was delaying pending clarity on its role as executive or advisory, as being discussed at System level. The first meeting of the ISC is proposed for May, if the membership can be finalized in time, to coincide with face-to-face PMC and Flagship and Country Co-ordinator meetings.

***Action Point – TR to share proposed ISC membership***

**Country strategies**

A clear strategy is needed for guiding the expectations and investment in the priority country teams, including consideration of different categories reflecting the type of engagement (full holistic approach, or just one dimension) and the level of bilateral funding successfully mobilized to support it. **Action Point** TR to circulate revised ToR for the county leader

**Strategic partnerships**

The operational modalities and roles for SLU and GiZ require further clarification. Issue briefs will be prepared in this respect and circulated to PMC for discussion and decision. Issues regarding how SLU can engage as a full academic partner are emerging.

***Action Point – TR to consult on other CRP arrangements (LSHTM, Wageningen in A4NH).***

***Action Point – UM and TR to develop brief on describing the issues and options.***

***Action Point – TR to consult Tier 2 partners IMME, ICRAF, Wageningen about their expectations and draft ToRs***

**Calendar**

The frequency and timing of management meetings was discussed. PMC is proposed to have at least 3 physical face to face meetings in addition to briefer periodic virtual meetings (1.5 hrs by Webex):

* + May (middle of planning cycle for next year)
  + September – Budget process
  + December - make last min corrections and finalising POWB

The Leadership group (flagship leaders, cross cutting co-ordinators) to meet once a month. Issues passed on to management committee. Every second month, will include country co-ordinators to ensure more cross talk between flagship leaders and country co-ordinators. Other dd hoc meetings as required. PMC endorsed the use of Webex meetings since they are proving to be efficient.

**AOB**

The expected process for the re-submission of the two flagships not funded was reviewed. It has not been formally agreed yet.

* + Review ISPC comments, with external reviewers to help review.
  + Share our interpretation of key points with ISPC
  + ILRI may be organizing a Challenge dialogue for its Feeds & Forages strategy, that can provide input
  + Revise the flagship section from CRP proposal.
  + Submit to the ISPC at the end of May, with feedback in July. August for responding to any must-haves